

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/776,173	02/12/2004	Tadashi Sawayama	03500.013470.1	3762		
	7590 04/11/200 CELLA HARPER &		EXAM	EXAMINER		
30 ROCKEFEL	FELLER PLAZA KACKAR, RAM N			, RAM N		
NEW YORK, N	NY 10112		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER			
			1763			
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MO	NTHS	04/11/2007	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

·	•		μ
-	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Comments	10/776, <u>1</u> 73	SAWAYAMA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	•
	Ram N. Kackar	1763	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	;
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- tiod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this community in the mailing date of the community in the commun	
Status	•		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02	? March 2007.		
	his action is non-final.	•	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	wance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the meri	its is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 11</u> is/are pending in the ap	polication.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	•		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 11</u> is/are rejected.	• • •		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		•	
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a		ov the Examiner.	•
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr			21(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the		· ·	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	·		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
 Certified copies of the priority docume 	ents have been received.		
Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in A	oplication No	
Copies of the certified copies of the present	riority documents have been	received in this National Stage	Э
application from the International Bure			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ist of the certified copies not	received.	
************************************		·	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) Therefore 0	ummary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Praftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948))/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	· —	formal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	 ·	

Application/Control Number: 10/776,173

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (US 5819683) in view of Parry et al (US 4746500) and further in view of Pang et al (US 6194628).

Ikeda et al disclose a process of treatment of exhaust gas (Abstract), which contains unaffected gas, and by products from a vacuum processing apparatus for CVD or etch (Col 1 lines 10-20) by a trap, which contains heated filament (coil) in the path of the exhaust gas.

Ikeda et al further teach that the trap could be of any configuration provided it can produce heat such as tungsten (Col 8 lines 12-20). Further Ikeda et al disclose the trap to comprise a double wall structure for cooling purpose.

Regarding temperature it is noted that the temperature is specific to decomposition of a particular gas and is therefore result effective parameter and could be optimized.

However, temperature above 1000°C is disclosed by Parry et al (Col 2 line 30-35).

Parry et al further disclose a process of treatment of exhaust gas (Abstract), which contains unaffected gas, and by products from a vacuum processing apparatus (Abstract) by a trap, which contains heated filament (coil) in the path of the exhaust gas (Fig 1 and 2). Further

Application/Control Number: 10/776,173

Art Unit: 1763

Parry et al teach that the decomposition could be done by plasma or alternately by a heated filament (Abstract and Col 2 line 29-35).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use filament temperatures higher than 1000°C in order to decompose exhaust components, which need higher temperature.

Ikeda et al in view of Parry et al do not explicitly teach the use of above process for silicon or its compound based exhaust gases and powdery by-products. However Parry et al teach that the decomposition could be done by plasma or alternately by a heated filament, teaching thereby that the two processes are equivalent and heated trap could be used for silicon based powdery by-products too.

Pang et al disclose a process of treatment of silicon or its compound based exhaust gases and powdery by-product from a vacuum processing apparatus for by plasma (Abstract, Fig 2 and Fig 3 and Col 1 lines 21-30, Col 2 lines 34-53, Col 4 line 59- Col 5 line21 and lines 51-62) by decomposing it to gaseous products.

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use this process of heated filament for decomposing silicon-based by-products.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (US 5819683) in view of Parry et al (US 4746500) and Pang et al (US 6194628) as applied to claims 1-3, 5 and 11 and further in view of Shingo Murakami (US 4901668).

Ikeda et al do not disclose the vacuum processing apparatus to be a photo CVD apparatus.

Application/Control Number: 10/776,173

Art Unit: 1763

Since the process of exhaust gas treatment depends only upon the gas and not where it came from the disclosed process of Ikeda et al read on the claim.

However, Murakami discloses treatment of exhaust gas from a vacuum processing apparatus for photo CVD (Abstract and Fig 1).

Therefore using the exhaust gas treatment for an apparatus with photo CVD would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/2/2007have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the shape of the filament as an added limitation, Ikeda et al already teaches that the shape is material only to ensure good contact with the exhaust gas.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Page 5 Application/Control Number: 10/776,173

Art Unit: 1763

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ram N. Kackar whose telephone number is 571 272 1436. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 A.M to 5:P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571 272 1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ram Kackar

Primary Examiner AU 1763